UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/192,583	11/17/1998	TETSURO MOTOYAMA	5244-0084-2X	9978

22850 7590 03/12/2007	**EXAMINER**	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.	HO, CHUONG T	
1940 DUKE STREET		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	**ART UNIT**	**PAPER NUMBER**
	2616	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/12/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/12/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/192,583	MOTOYAMA, TETSURO
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHUONG T. HO	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *the appeal brief 11/27/06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/22/06*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

1.   The amendment filed 11/27/06 have been entered and made of record.

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of the Appeal brief filed on 11/27/06, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. The new office action set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

3.   Claims 1-53 is pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject

matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-15, 23-26, 31-32, 34-37, 45-46, 48, 50-52 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazaridis et al. (U.S.Patent No.

6,219,694 B1) in view of Chapman et al. (U.S.Patent No. 6,522,421 B2).

In the claim 1, Lazaridis et al. discloses determining a system for pushing

information from a host system (a computer) to a mobile data communication device (a

business device) upon sensing a triggering event is disclosed (see abstract). A

redirector program operating at the host system (a computer) enables a user to

continuously redirect certain user's mobile data communication device upon detecting

the one or more user-defined triggering events has occurred (see abstract); A list of

message characteristics that determine whether a message is to be redirected. If

activated, the preferred list mode causes the redirector program 12 to operate like a

filter, only redirecting certain user data items based on whether the data item was sent

from a sender on the preferred list or has certain message characteristics that if present

will trigger or suppress redirection of the message (see col. 8, lines 9-11); comprising:

- Receiving an electronic mail message by a computer; determining, by the

  computer, whether a content of the message (the word "instruction" is the

  characteristic of the e-mail) is for a user (user's desktop system 10) or for an

  attached device (a mobile data communication device) associated with the

  computer by detecting a characteristic of the e-mail, the attached device being a

business office device (a mobile data communication device) including a

processor (see abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11);

- transmitting a communication from the computer (user's desktop system 10) to

the attached device (a mobile data communication device), if the determining

step determines that the received message to monitoring or control of the

attached device (see abstract, determining a system for pushing information from

a host system (a computer) to a mobile data communication device (a business

device) upon sensing a triggering event is disclosed (see abstract). A redirector

program operating at the host system (a computer) enables a user to

continuously redirect certain user's mobile data communication device upon

detecting the one or more user-defined triggering events has occurred (see

abstract); (see col. 8, lines 9-11, a list of message characteristics that determine

whether a message is to be redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode

causes the redirector program 12 to operate like a filter, only redirecting certain

user data items based on whether the data item was sent from a sender on the

preferred list or has certain message characteristics that if present will trigger or

suppress redirection of the message);

- operating the processor of the attached device (a mobile data communication

device) in response to the transmitted communication (once the message (A or

B) is received by the mobile device 24), the outer envelope B is removed and the

original message A is placed in the secondary memory store within the mobile

device 24. By repacking and removing the outer envelope in this manner, the

present invention causes the mobile computer 24 to appear to be at the same physical location as the host system 10, thus creating a transparent system);

- control of attached image printing device associated with the computer; and transmitting a communication from the computer to the attached image printing device (col. 3, lines 52-53, the redirector routes these attachments to an external machine that is compatible with the particular attachment, such as an attached printer or networked fax machine) (col. 3, lines 10-15, col. 3, lines 52-53, determined by the redirector whether the content of the E-mail is for the attached printer or network fax machine)

However, Lazaridis et al. is silent to disclosing that the email contain instruction for control/monitoring the printer.

Chapman (U.S.Patent No. 6,522,421 B2) discloses that embedding instruction in the data transmitting to the printer (col. 3, lines 15-17, lines 57-58, the email message or electronic mail may be transmitted by telephone lines to computers that are coupled to the printers) so that the printer will perform a print job and email back status information (col. 3, lines 5-6, a method of automatically returning status and error information from a printer using email).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Lazaridis with the teaching of Chapman to embedding instruction in the data transmitting to the printer in order to diagnose of troubles in such devices. Therefore, it would have enabled the user to be informed of the status of print job.

In the claim 23, Lazaridis et al. discloses determining a system for pushing information from a host system (a computer) to a mobile data communication device (a business device) upon sensing a triggering event is disclosed (see abstract). A redirector program operating at the host system (a computer) enables a user to continuously redirect certain user's mobile data communication device upon detecting the one or more user-defined triggering events has occurred (see abstract); A list of message characteristics that determine whether a message is to be redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode causes the redirector program 12 to operate like a filter, only redirecting certain user data items based on whether the data item was sent from a sender on the preferred list or has certain message characteristics that if present will trigger or suppress redirection of the message (see col. 8, lines 9-11); comprising:

- Receiving an electronic mail message by a computer; determining, by the computer, whether a content of the message (the word "instruction" is the characteristic of the e-mail) is for a user (user's desktop system 10) or for an attached device (a mobile data communication device) associated with the computer by detecting a characteristic of the e-mail, the attached device being a business office device (a mobile data communication device) including a processor (see abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11);

- transmitting a communication from the computer (user's desktop system 10) to the attached device (a mobile data communication device), if the determining step determines that the received message to monitoring or control of the

attached device (see abstract, determining a system for pushing information from a host system (a computer) to a mobile data communication device (a business device) upon sensing a triggering event is disclosed (see abstract). A redirector program operating at the host system (a computer) enables a user to continuously redirect certain user's mobile data communication device upon detecting the one or more user-defined triggering events has occurred (see abstract); (see col. 8, lines 9-11, a list of message characteristics that determine whether a message is to be redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode causes the redirector program 12 to operate like a filter, only redirecting certain user data items based on whether the data item was sent from a sender on the preferred list or has certain message characteristics that if present will trigger or suppress redirection of the message);

- operating the processor of the attached device (a mobile data communication device) in response to the transmitted communication (once the message (A or B) is received by the mobile device 24), the outer envelope B is removed and the original message A is placed in the secondary memory store within the mobile device 24. By repacking and removing the outer envelope in this manner, the present invention causes the mobile computer 24 to appear to be at the same physical location as the host system 10, thus creating a transparent system);

- control of attached image printing device associated with the computer; and transmitting a communication from the computer to the attached image printing device (col. 3, lines 52-53, the redirector routes these attachments to an external

machine that is compatible with the particular attachment, such as an attached

printer or networked fax machine) (col. 3, lines 10-15, col. 3, lines 52-53,

determined by the redirector whether the content of the E-mail is for the attached

printer or network fax machine)

However, Lazaridis et al. is silent to disclosing that the email contain instruction for

control/monitoring the printer.

Chapman (U.S.Patent No. 6,522,421 B2) discloses that embedding instruction in

the data transmitting to the printer (col. 3, lines 15-17, lines 57-58, the email message or

electronic mail may be transmitted by telephone lines to computers that are coupled to

the printers) so that the printer will perform a print job and email back status information

(col. 3, lines 5-6, a method of automatically returning status and error information from a

printer using email).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify the system of Lazaridis with the teaching of Chapman to embedding

instruction in the data transmitting to the printer in order to diagnose of troubles in such

devices. Therefore, it would have enabled the user to be informed of the status of print

job.

6.   In the claims 2, 24, 34, Lazaridis et al. discloses determining whether the

received message includes instructions (the word "instruction" is the characteristic of the

e-mail) for operating the device or whether the received message which has been

received has been received has a user of the computer as an end recipient (see

abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11).

7.   In the claims 3, 25, Lazaridis discloses displaying, after the receiving step, a

message to the user indicating the electronic mail message contains information to be

forward to the device, wherein the determining step comprises: determining by a user

reading the displayed message whether the received message includes instructions

(the word "instruction" is the characteristic of the e-mail) is for operating the device (see

abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11).

8.   In the claim 8, Lazaridis et al. discloses receiving an Internet electronic mail

message (see abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11, figure 1).

9.   In the claim 12, Lazaridis et al. discloses determining whether the message is for

the user (the user's desktop system 10) or for the attached device automatically by

detecting a characteristic (the word "instruction" is the characteristic of the e-mail) (see

abstract, col. 8, lines 9-11).

10.   In the claim 45, Lazaridis et al. discloses receiving data from the device, in

response to the step of operating the processor; creating an electronic mail message

(repackage the user-selected data items in an electronic wrapper prior to push the data

items to the mobile device) by computer (the user's desktop system 10) including the

data which has been received; and transmitting over the Internet the electronic mail

message generated by the computer.

11.   In the claims 46, 31, 50, 51, Lazaridis et al. discloses executing, by a device

driver of the computer, commands for at least one of controlling and monitoring the

device (see col. 1, lines 11-15, the system and method of the present invention provide

an event-driven redirection computer program ("redirector program") operating at the

host system, which, upon sensing a particular user-defined event has occurred,

redirects user-selected data items from the host system to the user's mobile data

communication device (Business office device including CPU) (col. 7, lines 14-15).

12.   In the claims 4, 48, 26, 32, Chapman, see figure 3, discloses Executing a

command which causes the step of transmitting to be performed (see figure 3, col. 3,

lines 5-7).

13.   In the claims 9, 27, Lazaridis discloses the step of executing a command

comprises transmitting information to a device driver executing within the computer; and

step of transmitting is performed using the device driver (see col. 1, lines 13-16).

14.   In the claim 10, Lazaridis discloses receiving, by the device, the communication

transmitted from the computer; and transmitting parameters from the device to the

computer, in response to the communication which has been received by the device

(see col. 6, lines 42-45).

15.   In the claims 13, 35, 36, 37, 52, Lazaridis discloses determining that the

message for operating the attached device automatically by detecting a code within the

message (see col. 8, lines 9-11, a list of message characteristics that determine

whether a message is to be redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode causes the

redirector program 12 to operate like a filter, only redirecting certain user data items

based on whether the data item was sent from a sender on the preferred list or has

certain message characteristics that if present will trigger or suppress redirection of the

message).

16.   In the claim 14, Lazaridis discloses determining that the message for operating

the attached device automatically by detecting a code which is the subject of the

message (see col. 8, lines 9-11, a list of message characteristics that determine

whether a message is to be redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode causes the

redirector program 12 to operate like a filter, only redirecting certain user data items

based on whether the data item was sent from a sender on the preferred list or has

certain message characteristics that if present will trigger or suppress redirection of the

message).

17.   In the claim 15, Lazaridis discloses determining that the message is for the

attached device automatically by detecting a code within the message (see col. 8, lines

9-11, a list of message characteristics that determine whether a message is to be

redirected. If activated, the preferred list mode causes the redirector program 12 to

operate like a filter, only redirecting certain user data items based on whether the data

item was sent from a sender on the preferred list or has certain message characteristics

that if present will trigger or suppress redirection of the message).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

19.   Claims 5-7, 11, 16-17, 27-29, 30, 47, 33, 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined system (Lazaridis – Chapman) in view

of Zerber (U.S.Patent No. 5,951,636).

In the claims 5, 6, 7, 27, 33, the combined system (Lazaridis – Chapman)

discloses the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, the combined system (Lazaridis – Chapman) is silent to disclosing the

executing program code of a file which is attached to the message by a manual action

by the user.

Zerber discloses executing program code of a file which is attached to the

message by a manual action by the user (see abstract).

Both Lazaridis, Chapman, and Zerber discloses e-mail message. Zerber

discloses executing program code of a file which is attached to the message by a

manual action by the user. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system (Lazaridis –

Chapman) with the teaching of Zerber to executing program code of a file which is

attached to the message by a manual action in order to limit to only those messages the

user want to downloaded.

20.   Regarding to claims 6, 29, Zerber et al. discloses executing the program code of

the file by pointing, using a pointing device and graphical user interface, to an object

representing the file (see abstract).

21.   Regarding to claims 7, 28, Zerber et al. discloses executing the code by pressing

a button while pointing the object representing the file (see abstract).

22.   Regarding to claim 11, Zerber et al. performing a mechanical action by the

device, in response to the communication which has been received by the device (see

abstract).

23.   Regarding to claims 16, 17, 30, 38, 39, Zerber et al. discloses the determining

step is performed in response to a receipt of an incoming electronic mail message (see

col. 2, lines 30-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

24.   Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

combined system (Lazaridis – Chapman) in view of Miyachi (U.S.Patent No.

6,108,492).

Regarding to claim 47, the combined system (Lazaridis - Chapman) discloses

the limitations of claim 1 above.

However, the combined system (Lazaridis - Chapman) is silent to disclosing the

business office device at least one of generates an image on a recording medium and

scans an image on a recording medium.

Miyachi discloses wherein the business office device at least one of generates an image on a recording medium and scans an image on a recording medium (see col. 2, lines 27-35).

Both Lazaridis, Chapman, and Miyachi disclose the office deive. Miyachi discloses the business office device at least one of generates an image on a recording medium and scans an image on a recording medium. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined system (Lazaridis - Motoyama) with the teaching of Miyachi to provide the business office device at least one of generates an image on a recording medium and scans an image on a recording medium in order to carry out remote diagnose of troubles in business communication devices.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

26.   Claims 18, 40, 49, 53   are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi (U.S.Patent No. 6,108,492) in view of Motoyama. (U.S.Patent No. 5,412,779).

Regarding to claim 18, see figure 1, Miyachi discloses transmitting device status (abstract, Host 110 b automatically will connect to a remote monitoring computer (170 and provide the status information) information from a device (computer equipment used to scan, print, facsimile 110a) to a computer (host 110b) attached to the device (110a); comprising:

- Transmitting state information of an device from the device (figure 4, host 110a) to a first computer (figure 4, host 110a directly attached to the device (figure 4, host 110a) (see col. 10, lines 37-40, the processor 235 checks if the host 110b has requested the current status information. If so, the processor 235 reads the status information from the data storage device 245 and transmits the status information via the communication interface 235 to the hosts's processor 230);

- processing, automatically without human intervention, automatically), the state information by software component within the first computer (col. 5, lines 48-50, the host 110b includes management software stored in the long term data storage device 240 for managing status jobs) (col. 8, lines 66-67, this status information is obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in a data base preferably in the non- volatile rewritable data storage device 240) (col. 10, lines 62-63, Host 110b using its modem 260 for connecting to the remote monitoring computer 170 and uploading the status information);

- transmitting by the first computer (110b), automatically without human intervention, the processed state information over the Internet to a monitoring second computer (170) (col. 8, lines 66-67, this status information is obtained from the MFP 110a and

stored in a data base preferably in the non- volatile rewritable data storage device

240) (col. 10, lines 62-63, Host 110b using its modem 260 for connecting to the

remote monitoring computer 170 and uploading the status information) .

However, Miyachi is silent to disclosing transmitting state information including at

least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device from the

image printing device to a first computer, the image printing device including a

processor.

Motoyama discloses transmitting state information including at least one of static,

semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device (see 106, 107, figure 1, col.

3, lines 15-20) from the image printing device (copier engine 10) to a first computer

(optional panel 20), the image printing device including a processor (see 102, figure 1)

Both Miyachi, and Motoyama discloses device status information. Motoyama

recognizes transmitting state information including at least one of static, semi-static, and

dynamic states of an image printing device (see 106, 107, figure 1, col. 3, lines 15-20)

from the image printing device (copier engine 10) to a first computer (optional panel 20),

the image printing device including a processor (see 102, figure 1). Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

system of Miyachi with the teaching of Motoyama to provide state information including

at least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device from

the image printing device to a first computer, the image printing device including a

processorin order to send out the status information to the user via e-mail.

27.   In the claim 40, see figure 1, Miyachi discloses transmitting device status

(abstract, Host 110 b automatically will connect to a remote monitoring computer (170

and provide the status information) information from a device (computer equipment

used to scan, print, facsimile 110a) to a computer (host 110b) attached to the device

(110a); comprising:

- Transmitting state information of an device from the device (figure 4, host 110a) to a

    first computer (figure 4, host 110a directly attached to the device (figure 4, host

    110a) (see col. 10, lines 37-40, the processor 235 checks if the host 110b has

    requested the current status information. If so, the processor 235 reads the status

    information from the data storage device 245 and transmits the status information

    via the communication interface 235 to the hosts's processor 230);

- processing, automatically without human intervention, automatically), the state

    information by software component within the first computer (col. 5, lines 48-50, the

    host 110b includes management software stored in the long term data storage

    device 240 for managing status jobs) (col. 8, lines 66-67, this status information is

    obtained from the MFP 110a and stored in a data base preferably in the non- volatile

    rewritable data storage device 240) (col. 10, lines 62-63, Host 110b using its modem

    260 for connecting to the remote monitoring computer 170 and uploading the status

    information);

- transmitting by the first computer (110b), automatically without human intervention,

    the processed state information over the Internet to a monitoring second computer

    (170) (col. 8, lines 66-67, this status information is obtained from the MFP 110a and

stored in a data base preferably in the non- volatile rewritable data storage device

240) (col. 10, lines 62-63, Host 110b using its modem 260 for connecting to the

remote monitoring computer 170 and uploading the status information) .

However, Miyachi is silent to disclosing transmitting state information including at

least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device from the

image printing device to a first computer, the image printing device including a

processor.

Motoyama discloses transmitting state information including at least one of static,

semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device (see 106, 107, figure 1, col.

3, lines 15-20) from the image printing device (copier engine 10) to a first computer

(optional panel 20), the image printing device including a processor (see 102, figure 1)

Both Miyachi, and Motoyama discloses device status information. Motoyama recognizes

transmitting state information including at least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic

states of an image printing device (see 106, 107, figure 1, col. 3, lines 15-20) from the

image printing device (copier engine 10) to a first computer (optional panel 20), the

image printing device including a processor (see 102, figure 1). Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the

system of Miyachi with the teaching of Motoyama to provide state information including

at least one of static, semi-static, and dynamic states of an image printing device from

the image printing device to a first computer, the image printing device including a

processorin order to send out the status information to the user via e-mail.

28.   Regarding to claims 49, 53, Miyachi discloses wherein the business office

device at least one of generates an image on a recording medium and scans an image

on a recording medium (see col. 2, lines 27-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed
> or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the
> subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject
> matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made
> to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was
> made.

29.   Claims 19-22, 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over the combined system (Miyachi – Motoyama) in view of Lazaridis et al. (U.S.Patent

No. 6,219,694 B1).

Regarding to claims 19, 41, the combined system (Miyachi – Motoyama)

discloses the limitations of claims 18, 40 above.

However, the combined system (Miyachi – Motoyama) is silent to disclosing

transmitting the information from the device driver to a messaging application program

interface (MAPI) of the computer; and processing the information by the MAPI, wherein

the step of transmitting the electronic mail message comprises transmitting the

electronic mail message corresponding to the information which has been processed by

the MAPI.

Lazaridis et al. discloses transmitting the information from the device driver to a

messaging application program interface (MAPI) of the computer; and processing the

information by the MAPI, wherein the step of transmitting the electronic mail message

comprises transmitting the electronic mail message corresponding to the information

which has been processed by the MAPI (see col. 7, lines 31-45).

Both Miyachi, Motoyama, Lazaridis discloses the an electronic message

transmitting from computer to device. Lazaridis recognizes transmitting the information

from the device driver to a messaging application program interface (MAPI) of the

computer; and processing the information by the MAPI, wherein the step of transmitting

the electronic mail message comprises transmitting the electronic mail message

corresponding to the information which has been processed by the MAPI. Thus, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

the combined system (Miyachi – Motoyama) with the teaching of Lazaridis to transmit

transmitting the information from the device driver to a messaging application program

interface (MAPI) of the computer; and processing the information by the MAPI, wherein

the step of transmitting the electronic mail message comprises transmitting the

electronic mail message corresponding to the information which has been processed by

the MAPI in order to delivery of the data items from the host system of the divice.

30.   Regarding to claims 20, 42, Lazaridis et al. discloses the computer is a message

transfer agent, the step of transmitting information from the device transmit the

information from the device directly to the computer which is the message transfer

agent, and the step of transmitting the electronic mail message transmits the electronic

mail message using a TCP connection from the computer which is a message transfer agent (see col. 8, lines 32-35).

31.   Regarding to claims 21, 43, Lazaridis et al. discloses creating a file corresponding to the information; and writing the file to a mail spoon directory of the computer; and.wherein the step of transmitting the electronic mail message comprising transmitting the electronic mail message corresponding to the information using the file stored in the mail spool directory (see col. 7, lines 35-37).

32.   Regarding to claims 22, 44, Lazaridis et al. discloses creating and writing comprising creating a plurality of files and writing the plurality of files in the mail spool directory; and transmitting the electronic mail message using each of the plurality of files stored in the mail spoon directory (see col. 7, lines 31-40).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHUONG T. HO whose telephone number is (571) 272-3133. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

02/28/07

HUY D. VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600